

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 15, 2001

LB 536

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Mr. Speaker, I am going to rise again in opposition to the motion to reconsider because, as you recall, I had some misgivings about the underlying motion as being an inappropriate recommitment. In this...in that instance it, in fact, would not have been a recommitment to the Agriculture Committee because the bill had never been in the Agriculture Committee. The more appropriate motion, as I suggested on the earlier discussion, would have been I think a motion to recommit to Revenue, and I have now filed that motion, which I think is a much more appropriation motion under the circumstances. And part of the reason I would think that it is appropriate to recommit this bill to the Revenue Committee, when that motion comes up, is that I would like the committee to take the time to sort out the merits of the earlier Raikes amendment which, if you'll recall, set out a matrix so that we could determine when state subsidies were actually necessary or, if you will, appropriate to go as a production incentive and when we could find market forces, that's a euphemism for profits, that would produce the same result. Because if we are to produce ethanol, and I think we surely are, then we would have a clear choice as to whether or not that effort was supported by the market or whether that support was receiving the kind of artificial support from government that LB 536, as it now stands, represents. And when I say that kind of artificial support from...by government, I am not discounting the fact that a great deal of the financing for LB 536 comes from producers of one kind or another who would have an interest in ethanol production so...and they're, clearly in the private sector, those persons who would support the ethanol incentives through the commodity checkoff or who would support the initiative through the...I guess we're calling it the gluten tax. That's always a little bit confusing to me because it appears to be cattle feed. Somehow I think of...I must be confusing glue with gluten, so I don't know exactly...well, Senator Chambers, I...if you're confused one may as well confess it because you never can tell when somebody observing your state of confusion won't try to straighten you out in a kindly way. So I'm not sure why we call that tax the gluten tax, but I think for purposes of references it's appropriate. Most people seem to be doing that and I hope you know what I'm referring to by that. Other people, in a somewhat confusing way, are sometimes referring to it as